

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 5-7, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 8-14 are hereby added. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 63, line 20 to page 65, line 22, and Fig. 14. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7 were rejected, in the Final Office Action dated August 24, 2004, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,497 to Ellis.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A portable information terminal apparatus...comprising...

synchronization means for synchronizing said program information and/or said user's schedule list of said portable information terminal apparatus with one or more external apparatuses...

program recording history means for recording viewing patterns of said user...

wherein said synchronizing occurs automatically or by said operation input of said user.” (emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Ellis does not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of synchronization means for synchronizing program information and/or a user's schedule list of a portable information terminal apparatus with one or more external apparatuses or a program recording history means for recording viewing patterns of a user, wherein the synchronizing occurs automatically or by an operation input of the user, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claims 5-7 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 5-7 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800